



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the blocking of the way for any successful negotiations in their behalf on the part of the administration. What is called the moral effect of the resolution will be quite as strong in this direction as in giving support and encouragement to the Cuban cause.

A small body of Senators, including the ablest and most truly American of them all, made a dignified and courageous stand against the rushing tide of jingoistic sentimentalism which would be only too happy to have this country immediately involved in a bloody and costly war with somebody. But their efforts to show the uselessness of the resolution, and the impropriety of the attempt to force the President's hand and to dictate his foreign policy exactly at the moment when he was known to be engaged in negotiations in the interests of Cuba, were all unavailing.

The question is not one of sympathy with the cause of Cuban freedom, for all Americans without distinction have that. Nor of detestation of the oppressive and cruel methods of the Spaniard, for in this, too, all citizens of this country are one. The question is, what rôle the United States, the friend of all nations, the great promoter of liberty and peace and of the Christian progress of the world, shall play in her relations to other nations. Her true policy in these relations is undoubtedly that expounded by the Senators who opposed the Morgan resolution, as it has been expounded and practiced for the most part by the preceding President and by Mr. McKinley so far in his administration. If the nation continues to follow, as she has mostly followed in the past, this policy of peaceful non-interference she may retain her position at the van of Christian civilization. But if she falls into the opposite course, as she seems in growing danger of doing, and undertakes to interfere by violence in the affairs of other nations, however justifiable such interference may seem in any particular case, she will sooner or later be led away by her self-righteousness and find herself at the bottom of a hopeless *impasse* of international entanglement, like the nations of Europe, whose selfish policy of armed interference in the affairs of others has brought them to about the last degree of degradation.

We shall hope that, though the former administration failed in its attempt at peaceful mediation between the Spanish government and the Cubans, President McKinley may succeed in persuading the authorities at Madrid that it would be in every way honorable to Spain freely to grant the Cubans the opportunity to say how they will be governed in the future. It has been believed that a probable change in the Spanish ministry would make this negotiation much more likely to have the desired issue. The passing of the Morgan resolution seems, however, to have united all parties in Spain in the deter-

mination to resist every attempt of the United States to mediate in behalf of the Cubans.

THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL CONGRESS.

The Universal Postal Congress which has been in session in Washington since the 5th of May is a much more significant and important assemblage than the limited space devoted to it in the papers would indicate. The postal service, which has in recent years become world-wide and has rapidly developed both in the facilities and in the speed of transportation of the mails, is a service which affects closely the interests of every nation. It is an absolute necessity of modern life. It is not strange, then, that practically all the nations of the world have entered into the Postal Union. When this Congress opened at Washington only three nations were still outside, and two of these, Corea and the Orange Free State, have since given in their adhesion and have delegates at Washington. This leaves only China outside, and she is expected to come in before the Congress closes, as her delegates are at Washington. We shall then have *the first union in history including all the nations of the world.*

Such an event ought not to be passed by without the attention which it deserves. The Postal Union is one of the first ripe fruits of the new internationalism of our time, which is ultimately to bring all the nations of the world into a regular and harmonious coöperation in the promotion of the highest interests of each and all. Such a union establishes, so far, the peace of the world, and must prove a powerful antidote, in its way, in preventing the periodic outbreak of war with its disturbances and destructions.

It is interesting to notice that this first world-union of the nations should have grown up about apparently so simple a matter as the conveying of information by letter from individual to individual in different parts of the earth. But in reality it is not a simple matter at all, but a very complex and serious one. All the interests of society, in religion, in business, in science, etc., depend upon the efficiency and trustworthiness of the service by which people communicate one with another. The more complete and reliable this service, the more rapid and sure the progress of society. The service must, in its very nature, enlarge and develop trust between man and man, and between nation and nation, for it is founded on trust and proceeds by trust. A crime against mail transportation is now everywhere considered among the most serious of crimes. The question naturally arises, if men and nations have thus established peace between themselves in this matter, why can not the same be done in every direction in which they have relations one with another. There is but one answer possible. Such universal, world-wide peace is sure to come, for the necessi-

ties as well as the moralities of life are everywhere pressing it upon the nations.

The Congress is meeting in the great hall of the old Corcoran Art Gallery, which is richly decorated for the occasion. There are delegates present from fifty-five countries, including nearly all of those in the postal union. The Congress was welcomed by Postmaster-General Gary who said that it was "probable that by the time the Congress adjourns the sun will not rise upon a civilized people nor set upon an organized government which is not included in the wise and beneficent jurisdiction of the Universal Postal Union." General G. S. Batcheller, the oldest of the United States delegates, is President of the Congress. Mr. Hehn, director of the Postal Union at Berne, is Secretary. The desk of Dr. von Stephan, of Germany, the founder of the Postal Union, to whose recent decease allusion was made in our last number, has been draped in mourning. Allusion was made in the opening address by Mr. Gary to the fact that the idea of a permanent Universal Postal Union originated with Postmaster-General Blair of this country in August 1862. Thus this whole great postal system has grown up within thirty-five years.

The sessions of the Congress are held behind closed doors. The discussions are in French. The Congress is carefully examining all the provisions of the present postal union laws with a view to revision where necessary. The work is done chiefly by Committees which examine the subjects and then report them about once a week to the full Congress, which is expected to continue in session for about two weeks more.

OUR UN-AMERICAN ANGLOMANIA.

It is not often that we give any attention to an anonymous letter. But the one given below is so refreshing in its frankness and *naïveté* that we are sure the reading of it will give great pleasure to all our friends. It is delightful to be thrashed in such an unconventional way. We fairly felt our back bleed with pleasure as we read. We commend the letter of this young apostle of prejudice and hate to him of the *Outlook* who wrote the article alluded to on "School Histories." It was he who has gotten us into all this trouble. We borrowed his article and in turn are delighted to lend him our thrashing. We commend the letter also to all "our English cousins." How *very pleased* they will be to see exactly in what light their country is regarded by a *genuine American* whose name even, if we had it, would show no trace of Anglo-Saxon depravity! How appalled they will be to learn in just what way England is to come to her ruin! And how they will hasten to repent in sackcloth and ashes, like the people of Nineveh, before St. Paul's begins to tumble down on their heads!

Editor of the Advocate of Peace:

I have with great interest read several numbers of your paper, and the more I read the more un-American do I find your institution to be. The ostensible object of your association is to effect international peace. This, sir, I venture to assert, can never be accomplished. War will ever be the instrument by which the Almighty castigates sinful nations; and consequently, in your endeavors to abolish war you are bringing upon yourselves the difficult task to abolish sin.

I would refer you to the gospel of St. Luke, if you wish to learn the sentiments of Scripture on war (Luke Chap. XXI.), wherein, it is asserted that at the end of the world nation shall rise against nation etc.

Before I proceed farther, sir, allow me to inform you that I am an American-born citizen, though of German descent; and as such, sir, I became very indignant when I scanned an article in the May number entitled "School Histories and International Animositities." In this article, I affirm, you make an unjust attack upon American histories, you very nearly implying as much as if we were to have our history written or at least ratified by British historians.

Commenting on the unjust dislike that Americans have for the "mother country," the worthy Samuel Plimsoll declares that the English have no such feeling toward America. Sir, does this Mr. Plimsoll know the history and nature of his own countrymen? Apparently not.

The English have always taken the lead in creating animosity between the two nations. Again, sir, how can you reasonably demand good feelings between the two nations, when such writers as Mr. Dickens have done their utmost to place the social affairs of our country in a degraded light? Sir, I would advise the author of the above mentioned article to study the history of the United States more thoroughly, and if he be an American, he will certainly find no cause to blame the American school boy for entertaining hostile, I should rather say, prejudiced opinions on the British.

The act of vandalism perpetrated by the British when at the capitol, the dastardly act of seizing Union vessels, and siding with the rebel in the cause of secession and slavery, can never be forgotten by a true citizen. Again, dear sir, if you wish to know why the prejudices of the American are levelled specially at Great Britain, you must recollect that we have never come into hostile contact with any but Britain's often unjust views.

Sir, if you have ever read Irving's works (a fact which I doubt greatly), you will find that England, or, as you call her, "the mother country" has always set us a bad example. To quote a passage from Irving's "English Writers on America:" "She (England) is instilling anger and resentment into the bosom of a youthful nation, to grow with its growth, and strengthen with its strength. If in America, as some of her (England's) writers are laboring to convince her, she is to find an invidious rival and a gigantic foe, she may thank those very writings for having provoked rivalry and irritated hostility." Thus, my dear sir, British and not American writers are the cause of the dislike existing between the two countries. I should advise you to read this entire production of Irving's, and your Anglo-mania may be partially dispelled.

While the national character of America was still in a state of fermentation, England had the audacity to sour